Whereas United States citizens of Pakistani or Indian origin have contributed greatly to the advancement of knowledge, the development of the United States economy, and the enrichment of cultural life in the United States;

Whereas the ties of trade and investment among the United States, India, and Pakistan have grown over fifty years to the great benefit of the people of all three countries; and

Whereas the fiftieth anniversary of the independence of Pakistan and India offers an opportunity for India, Pakistan, and the United States to renew their commitment to international cooperation on issues of mutual interest and concern: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the people of India and Pakistan on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of their nations' independence;

(2) looks forward to broadening and deepening United States cooperation and friendship with Pakistan and India in the years ahead for the benefit of the people of all three countries; and

(3) intends to send a delegation to India and Pakistan during this 50th anniversary year of independence to further enhance the mutual understanding among the United States, Pakistan, and India and among the United States Congress and the parliaments of those countries.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 157.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CORRECTING ERRORS IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 2014, TAXPAYER RELIEF ACT OF 1997

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 138) to correct technical errors in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 2014, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 138

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2014), to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(2) and (d) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) In the amendment proposed to be added by section 1085(c), strike ''section 407(d)'' and insert ''paragraph (4) or (7) of section 407(d)''.

(2) Strike subparagraph (B) of section 1031(e)(2) and insert the following:

''(B) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS PAID FOR TICKETS PURCHASED BEFORE OCTOBER 1, 1997.—The amendments made by subsection (c) shall not apply to amounts paid before October 1, 1997; except that—

''(i) the amendment made to section 4261(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall apply to amounts paid more than 7 days after the date of the enactment of this Act for transportation beginning on or after October 1, 1997, and

''(ii) the amendment made to section 4263(c) of such Code shall apply to the extent related to taxes imposed under the amendment made to such section 4261(c) on the amounts described in clause (i).''.

Mr. ARCHER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This enrolling resolution would make two corrections in the tax bill which just passed the House of Representatives, and that is H.R. 2014. The first correction would revise section 1085(c) to cover work experience and community service employment, but not subsidize private sector jobs.

Let me explain why this correction is necessary. The conference agreement intended to prohibit the payment of the earned income tax credit to TANF recipients who were participating in workfare or community service jobs. However, the bill language denies the EITC to individuals in subsidized private employment or on-the-job training where the employer receives wage subsidy funds from the State that are financed by the TAIF funds, as well as to individuals in welfare or community service jobs. This problem appears to have stemmed from the fact that the drafters did not find a definition of the term ''workfare,'' in title IV–A. So they swept in a wide array of work activities, including subsidized private sector employment, and this concurrent resolution would put in place the intent of what Congress was acting to do.

☐ 1745

The second correction would revise section 1031 of H.R. 2014 to delay the effective date of certain advance ticket purchases for air transportation beginning after September 30, 1997. The correction is needed to allow the airlines enough time to reprogram their computers for the new ticket pricing system as contained in H.R. 2014.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, I assume these corrections have been cleared with the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. ARCHER. I understand that they have. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] has approved these corrections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 138

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2014), to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(2) and (d) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) In the amendment proposed to be added by section 1085(c), strike ''section 407(d)'' and insert ''paragraph (4) or (7) of section 407(d)''.

(2) Strike subparagraph (B) of section 1031(e)(2) and insert the following:

''(B) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS PAID FOR TICKETS PURCHASED BEFORE OCTOBER 1, 1997.—The amendments made by subsection (c) shall not apply to amounts paid before October 1, 1997; except that—

''(i) the amendment made to section 4261(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall apply to amounts paid more than 7 days after the date of the enactment of this Act for transportation beginning on or after October 1, 1997, and

''(ii) the amendment made to section 4263(c) of such Code shall apply to the extent related to taxes imposed under the amendment made to such section 4261(c) on the amounts described in clause (i).''.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MEXICO'S ANTIDUMPING DUTIES

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43) urging the United States Trade Representative immediately to take all appropriate action with regards to Mexico's imposition of antidumping duties on United States high fructose corn syrup, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. EWING. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Senate Concurrent Resolution 43 expresses the sense of Congress that the government of Mexico should review carefully whether it initiated an anti-dumping investigation against United States exports of high fructose corn syrup in conformity with WTO standards. It urges the United States Trade Representative to take all appropriate measures with regard to the imposition of preliminary anti-dumping duties on U.S. exports of high fructose corn syrup.

These duties, which range from 61 percent to 102 percent, were imposed on June 25 as the result of a petition filed by the Mexican sugar industry. There is a question as to whether the Mexican Government adequately investigated if domestic producers of HFCS in Mexico are supportive of the petition. In light of the fact that United States corn growers and refiners, including many in my State of Illinois, are suffering the serious disruption of potentially prohibitive tariffs on their sales in Mexico, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I also want to pay tribute to my distinguished colleague from down state, he is more corn country than I am, because of his active involvement in getting Senate Concurrent Resolution 43 reported over to the House.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object, of course, to this resolution being brought, but I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, GLEN POSHARD, and myself have been most interested in seeing this resolution brought to the floor. I would just rise in strong support of the concurrent resolution, which talks about Mexico's recent decision to impose anti-dumping duties.

Prior to our adoption of the NAFTA treaty, duties on high fructose corn syrup were 15 percent. This year, under a negotiated agreement, they should have dropped to 9.5 percent. Duties now in effect because of this decision are as much as four to five times greater and above the pre-NAFTA level.

Mr. Speaker, this case involves both important matters of international trade policy and vital trade interests of the U.S. agricultural producers.

I would just like do elaborate for a moment. First, the preliminary findings of the Mexican Government were reached in what I believe is in violation of the World Trade Organization code on dumping investigation. The code requires that the government fully investigate allegations brought by private parties before opening government investigations.

In this case, it is my opinion that the Mexican sugar industry presented an inaccurate allegation and that there was no production of high fructose corn syrup in Mexico. I believe this to be wrong, and that the Mexican authorities should have known, if they did not, that it was wrong, and ignored their evidence that might have been available to them.

By itself this is grounds for dismissal of the case. Simply put, the Mexican sugar industry does not have standing under the WTO code to file this case, and the Government of Mexico chose to ignore that fact, for whatever reasons may have been expedient to them.

There is a second flaw. The Mexican authorities have failed to demonstrate that the high fructose corn syrup and the Mexican sugar are like products under the internationally accepted anti-dumping code. Beyond both the technical and the procedural flaws raised in the case, which should require its immediate dismissal, this action raises serious political and economic problems.

Mr. Speaker, I represent one of the four largest corn-producing districts in the U.S. Corn refining adds another $100 million to the value of the corn crop in my district, and I cannot stand idly by and allow others with whom we are trading to deny us access to their important markets. I hope that the Members will join me in supporting our corn farmers and processors, and send a strong message to the Mexican Government that we intend to defend the trading rights we have negotiated. I would ask for the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. EWING. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I rise today in strong support of this concurrent resolution, which criticizes Mexico's recent decision to impose antidumping duties against U.S. exports of high fructose corn syrup.

Prior to NAFTA, duties on high fructose corn syrup were 15 percent and were to be phased out over 10 years. Duties now in effect as a result of the Mexican Government's recent decision are four to five times the pre-Nafta levels.

Mexico would like us to believe that their small sugar mills are being overrun by large U.S. corporations. In reality, however, a small number of individuals own a very large share of the Mexican sugar mills. It is interesting to note that these same individuals rely heavily upon U.S. financial markets to fund their goals in expanding markets. I would suggest to my colleagues that perhaps it is time for Congress to review whether or not we want our financial markets open to those who refuse to compete against U.S. products.

Mr. Speaker, Mexico's action against fructose violates the standards of the World Trade Agreement, of which Mexico and the United States are Members. Important issues of standing and injury have been ignored and the Mexican Government has failed to investigate allegations known to be false.

On procedural grounds alone, this case should be dismissed. However, in addition to its procedural and technical flaws, Mexico's action raises serious economic concerns for this Nation and for my southeastern Illinois district. The 1996 farm bill eliminated traditional price supports available to U.S. corn farmers and replaced them with a phased-down market transition payment. Farmers were told that they must generate their income from the market, particularly the growing international market.

Mexico's decision to impose antidumping duties on U.S. exports of high fructose corn syrup, if left unchallenged, represents in my judgment a breach of faith with Illinois corn farmers, who were assured of their right to pursue markets around the world.

My district is home to several large corn refining plants which provide direct employment for over 2,000 of my constituents. It is estimated that corn refining adds over $70 million to the value of the corn crop in my district. Last year, consumption of high fructose corn syrup represented a market for about 500 million bushels of U.S. corn.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow competitive U.S. products to be shut out of this critical market. I hope my colleagues will join me and the other gentlemen from Illinois, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. EWING, in supporting our corn farmers and processors, and send a strong message to the Mexican Government that we intend to defend the trading rights that we have negotiated.

Most importantly, I hope all Members will join us in sending a message to our farmers that we have not forgotten the promises of the 1996 farm bill and that the U.S. Congress will defend their right to export.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the North American Free Trade Agreement (in this resolution, referred to as ''the NAFTA'') was intended to reduce trade barriers between Canada, Mexico and the United States;

Whereas the NAFTA represented an opportunity for corn farmers and refiners to increase exports of highly competitive United States corn and corn products;

Whereas corn is the number one United States cash crop with a value of $25,000,000,000;

Whereas United States corn refiners are highly efficient, provide over 10,000 nonfarm jobs, and add over $2,000,000 of value to the United States corn crop;

Whereas the Government of Mexico has initiated an antidumping investigation into imports of high fructose corn syrup from the United States which may violate the antidumping standards of the World Trade Organization;

Whereas on June 25, 1997, the Government of Mexico published a Preliminary Determination imposing very high antidumping duties on imports of United States high fructose corn syrup;

Whereas there has been concern that Mexico's initiation of the antidumping investigation was motivated by political pressure from the Mexican sugar industry rather than the merits of Mexico's antidumping law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Government of Mexico should review carefully whether it properly initiated this antidumping investigation in conformity with the standards set forth in the World Trade Organization Agreement on Antidumping, and should terminate this investigation immediately;

(2) if the United States Trade Representative considers that Mexico initiated this antidumping investigation in violation of World Trade Organization standards, and if the Government of Mexico does not terminate the antidumping investigation, then the United States Trade Representative should immediately undertake appropriate measures, including actions pursuant to the dispute settlement provisions of the World Trade Organization.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. The Chair requests that Mr. Egan come forward and take the oath of office as Chief Administrative Officer.

Mr. Egan appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

RESIGNATION AS LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL AND APPOINTMENT AS LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Speaker laid before the House the following resignation as Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, July 8, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I would like to resign from my position as the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives effective July 31, 1997. I would like to continue my service in the Office of the Legislative Counsel as a Senior Counsel.

I will leave my position knowing that my Office is finally fully enabled to provide needed services to the House.

As you know the primary function of the Office is to draft legislation (including amendments and conference reports) which will carry out the policy of the Members involved. Ideally, there would be time for conferences to develop the policy and the persons responsible for the policy would be available. If that can be done it is very satisfactory work to participate in the process. I have taken a real interest in seeing that the Office is able to effectively do its work.

When I joined the Office in 1962 it had 11 attorneys and did not provide services to all the Committees. A good working relationship had been established with only the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee on Commerce. However, through time and the changes in the Committees, the Office has been able to establish good working relationships with all the Committees. Without a doubt, your actions and those taken by your leadership have facilitated the Office in providing services to the Committees and the Leadership. I think it can be said that the House does not act on significant legislation which has not been a responsibility of an attorney in the Office.

The morale in the Office is quite high because of the action you took on the pay comparability with the Senate and also on account of the Committee responsibilities.

The tutorial process the Office follows with new attorneys allows the new attorney to begin Committee work with a fellow attorney in about a year. When the new attorney graduates to Committee work they feel they have been given a special responsibility.

Now an attorney doing Committee work can readily feel that he or she is making a significant contribution to a public measure.

I am encouraged about continuing in the Office. The Office undertook an extensive audit of its work and the problems presented to it in carrying out its work. As a result of the audit some very interesting work has been developed in communicating our services to the Members. The Office has a web site which provides information about the Office and the services it provides. In addition, we will soon have the capacity to fax material directly from our personal computers. That will relieve us of the time needed to make copies and deliver the work. In addition, the Office has developed a team to mediate differences in the Office. Finally, work has been done in improving the working conditions of the clerical/administrative staff. Consequently, I think we are doing well and we know what our difficulties are and we are prepared to deal with them.

I have particularly enjoyed serving as the Legislative Counsel under your Speakership.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. MEADE,
Legislative Counsel.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 521 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (2 U.S.C. 282), the Chair appoints Mr. M. Pope Barrow as Legislative Counsel of the United States House of Representatives, effective August 1, 1997.

The Chair would also like to thank Mr. Meade for his service to the House, and to remind all Members that the work done by the legislative counsels is absolutely essential to the job we do, and without the dedication and hard work and long hours of the legislative counsels, it would be literally impossible to have the legislative process that we now engage in.

□ 1800

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105–113)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iraqi emergency is to continue in effect beyond August 2, 1997, to the Federal Register for publication.

The crisis between the United States and Iraq that led to the declaration on August 2, 1990, of a national emergency has not been resolved. The Government of Iraq continues to engage in activities inimical to the stability in the Middle East and hostile to United States interests in the region. Such Iraqi actions pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and vital foreign policy interests of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to apply economic pressure on the Government of Iraq.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 31, 1997.*

DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105–114)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of February 10, 1997, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 12722 of August 2, 1990. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

This report discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 12722 and matters relating to Executive Orders 12724 and 12817 (the ''Executive Orders''). The report covers events from February 2 through August 1, 1997.

Executive Order 12722 ordered the immediate blocking of all property and interests in property of the Government of Iraq (including the Central Bank of Iraq) then or thereafter located in the United States or within the possession or control of a United States person. That order also prohibited the importation into the United